

Notes from conference call meeting 2/1/08

NEXT MEETING: FEBRUARY 14th

ATTENDEES:

Steve Hook
Dave Nail
Jill Saligoe-Simmel
Jim Sparks
Mike Morris
Kevin Holle
Lorraine Wright
Brad Meixell
Phil Worrall

Kevin – Report on yesterday's regional meeting and discussion on data sharing: 30-35 people in NE Indiana met on 1/31/08; Steve reporting on meeting, questions came up at that meeting if the 2005 ortho agreements that were signed would apply to data sharing now. Jim responded that those agreements need to be reviewed, to see if there are limitations that were placed on those data; data should be under the FOIA rules of the state. Steve's experience with the State Land Office 2007 data request was that IDHS wouldn't let State Lands rely on that agreement. Jim will review those agreements to assess the relevancy to current data exchange. Allen Co and Whitley Co expressed concerns regarding turning over data and its affect on their cost recovery. Jim reviewed state law regarding GIS data and fees. One county at the meeting indicated when they received a call regarding their fee structure they weren't getting customer call backs (e.g., no or few sales). State parcel ID discussion also led to questions if state would eventually require more restrictive data standards (e.g. Line width, types, etc).

Steve – can we look at GIS data as a service or infrastructure/public utility rather than a commodity? Kevin indicated Ft. Wayne started with cost recovery model (3-4 yrs they realized this wasn't a model that would work). Hamilton Co had similar experience.

Copy Right issues: Question arose regarding what qualifies as "copy rightable" data. It is clear in law that lists of things, e.g. Names and phone numbers, are not original works and thus not copy rightable. Question remains if GIS govt data can be copy righted. Jim doesn't think he'll get an answer on this from State Data Access Counselor or Sec. of State.

Brad indicated Clark Co had original concerns about private sector benefiting from reselling their data, but now has no fee/no restrictions. It becomes a service to the public. Mike (Noblesville) indicated the city doesn't charge either; Kevin (Ft. Wayne) also indicated he could participate. Rick from Kendleville also interested(?).

Example Noble Co current fee structure is \$2,100 parcel layer, 1 customer = Navtech. At the same time, they haven't been overly concerned with making the data available outside its original internal purpose.

What would those counties need that want to participate but have fee structures in place? Steve thinks it would be difficult to get this through those county commissioners. It is more about education and outreach - can IGIC create pamphlet with examples of benefits from counties and benefits to the counties?

Next Meeting – committee members provide feed back on content / concepts in MOU; suggestions for moving policy issues forward. Jill will integrate some of this content into a scope of work for

pilot project participants. Plan is to call for participation for Address Integration Pilot Project to be issued at the GIS Conference.

Note: March 25th 2008 is Purdue Road School